



Flack, A. J. P. (2016). Lions loose on a gentleman's lawn: animality, authenticity and automobility in the English safari park. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 54, 38-49.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhg.2016.08.001>

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):
CC BY-NC-ND

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1016/j.jhg.2016.08.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhg.2016.08.001)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Elsevier at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030574881630072X>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Lions loose on a gentleman's lawn: animality, authenticity and automobility in the English safari park

Andrew J.P. Flack

University of Bristol, Historical Studies, 13-15 Woodland Road, Clifton, Bristol, BS8 1TB, UK

Abstract

When the English safari park first appeared in the grounds of Longleat House in Wiltshire's rolling countryside in the spring of 1966, it was the first time that visitors to an animal park in Europe were awarded the freedom of the road as they meandered through captive animal spaces in search of eye-to-eye encounters with exotic animals from the comfort of their cars. This kind of park, where the illusions of both wildness and freedom in captivity might be said to be at their most intense, has, however, received almost no attention from scholars, not least in the arena of zoo histories but also in the fields of environmental histories and historical geographies more widely. Moreover, while historians of environment and technology have increasingly considered roads and automobility, they have rarely been examined in relation to wildlife. This article focuses on the earliest years of Europe's first drive-through safari park. It illustrates that these kinds of human-animal geographies reveal much about the ways in which humans, animals and technologies combine and interact with each other in the forging of various hybridities. In so doing it raises important questions about what constitutes authenticity and artificiality. The story of the emergence of the English safari park is, at its heart, a narrative of trouble. In the safari park, and well beyond, spatial categorisations, human and animal natures, and interspecies encounters in captive worlds were disrupted, disputed, and reconfigured.

Keywords: animals; authenticity; automobility; identity; wildlife; zoo;

Abbreviated article title: 'Lions loose on a gentleman's lawn'

Figure Captions:

- Figure 1: Longleat as shown on Google Earth map [19 July 2016]
- Figure 2: Longleat Safari Park lions, Author's Photograph, 16 July 2016
- Figure 3: Map of Longleat lion enclosure, Google Earth map [19 July 2016]
- Figure 4: Never been out of the country old boy – bagged that on the A362 outside Frome, Bath and Wiltshire Chronicle, 5 November 1965.

Lions loose on a gentleman's lawn: animality, authenticity, and automobility in the emergence of the English safari park.

Deep in the heart of the Wiltshire countryside lies Longleat Safari and Adventure Park (Fig. 1). Opened in 1966, the animal park forms a single part of the vast nine thousand acre Longleat estate, landscaped by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown in the later decades of the eighteenth century. In addition to the animal park, the estate is also noted for its Elizabethan house, completed by Sir John Thyme c. 1580, as well as for the more recently constructed Center Parcs holiday village which offers a 'back to nature' experience for body and soul. The animal park relies heavily on exoticising its animal exhibitions, crafting an exciting day out through a rich array of species and habitats, including Tiger Territory, Wolf Wood, Stingray Bay, Rockin' Rhinos, and Cheetah Kingdom. Above all the park has built its reputation on the intersection of exotic wildlife and the twentieth century's principal travel technology: the automobile. Its 'safari' experience is one in which visitors can drive their own cars through animal spaces.¹ 'Wild' and thrilling encounters crafted and mediated in large part by the automobile distinguish Longleat – a member of the British and Irish Association of Zoos and Aquariums (BIAZA) and the European Association of Zoos and Aquaria (EAZA) – from other varieties of animal attraction in the vicinity. Bristol Zoo (1835) and its recently opened sister establishment the Wild Place Project (2013), for example, both permit visitors the chance to encounter an array of species from Asiatic lion to cheetah in a diversity of habitats, but they do so within a philosophical frame of conservationism and only on foot, that more ancient and (usually) biotic travel technology. Over the long history of animal attractions mechanical travel technologies have usually served the purpose of dropping visitors at the gates without carrying them any further. When the English safari park first appeared in the grounds of the Longleat House estate in rural Wiltshire in the spring of 1966, it was the first time that visitors to an animal park in Europe were awarded the freedom of the road as they meandered through captive animal spaces in search of eye-to-eye encounters with exotic creatures (Fig. 2).

Such encounters are part of a deep and profound heritage of human-animal relationships spanning time and space. Animals are all around us, in all kinds of environments, and we have engaged with them – and they with us – in an astonishing diversity of ways over the course of our shared pasts. A rising awareness of the complexities inherent in these multispecies spaces inspired the development of a vibrant field of scholarly endeavour. Emergent over the course of recent decades, animal geography joins animal histories, animal studies, and environmental histories in its concern with the character of human interactions with wildlife in spaces past and present. Some of the major works in this field have examined the construction of the artifice of wildness, the character of 'hybrid geographies', the 'agency' of nonhuman animals and the affective affordances of animals in (diverse) relationship with humans.² While these literatures feature deep and insightful examinations of zoological gardens as geographies in which animals and animality are mediated, such works have not yet considered the context of the safari park, the ways in which it constructs nature nor the

character and consequences of the hybridisation of animal-human-machine at its heart.³ Indeed, while nature-techno-culture assemblies have featured in work relating to multispecies spaces such as farms, the general context of the road and of the car are conspicuous in their relative absence to date.⁴ And yet, cars and roads are principal sites of human-animal encounter. They permit access to the countryside, and they are localities of violence – as many as twenty-seven million birds are killed on European roads each year – just as much as they are spaces of sentimentality and ecological awareness in the form of nature tourism.⁵

These contexts and relationships are important. The ways humans move through space contributes in significant ways to the formation of both landscapes and the beings who constitute vibrant parts of its fabric. The human-automobile assemblage has been of much recent interest. Predominantly in the context of the USA and Europe, scholars have considered the structures of automobility, its impacts on environments and economies, and – of much relevance to our present concerns – the nature of the automotive gaze.⁶ Many of the concerns surrounding the gaze, however, relate to driving at speed, either through cities or along motorway corridors.⁷ Examination of opposition to the rise of automobility and its infrastructures has also focussed on speed: motorways were seen as ‘distinctively modern’, often dystopian, landscapes.⁸ And yet, slow or stationary mobilities are just as important as high speed in modern systems of mobility.⁹ For the most part, the wildlife encounters of the technological age – by boat, car, or balloon (though perhaps not the aeroplane) – have been dominated by leisurely or stationary mobilities. Slow motion allows for more to be seen, and in more detail, than is possible at greater velocities.¹⁰

Transport technologies are ubiquitous in the British landscape and an inherent part of the everyday. As the ‘predominant global form of “quasi-private” mobility’ it is important that we understand not only how automotive technologies mediate and influence our relationships with environments and their nonhuman occupants but also how humans, animals and automotive technologies craft each other in an era when industry and technology has done so much to mark the biosphere with the footprints of people.¹¹ In 2013, for instance, there were thirty-five million cars registered for use in the UK, using nearly 250,000 kilometres of road criss-crossing the country. One study estimated that people spend up to ten hours a week driving, compared to just 3.7 hours walking. In the rise of this kind of lifestyle landscapes and habitats have been fragmented and human exposure to the natural world reconfigured by the cultures of the car.¹² This article examines the emergence of the safari park as a particular kind of captive space emerging in a particular cultural context. By engaging these previously unrelated literatures – animal geographies, mobility and automobility – it seeks to understand the ways in which humans, animals and technologies combine and interact with each other and the consequences of those interactions for our perceptions of wildlife and landscape.

Captivity and travel technologies combined in the construction of what was sold to the British public as an ‘authentic’ encounter with wildlife at the same time as that combination fundamentally altered the behaviours of captive animals and the kinds of visitor encounters with them in the park. ‘Authenticity’ is a culturally contingent term denoting what is thought to be real, unmediated and, often, timeless. It denotes a perception of purity and this artifice sat at the heart of the park and the interspecies encounters it claimed to offer. In this context authentic animality was positioned as essentially divorced from the human world, while authentic human-animal encounters were meant to be as close as one could get to happening upon a wild beast in its native domain.

And yet, captive animals encountered metallic monsters while humans had their interactions with people and other animals regulated through their windscreens, car windows and the meandering curvature of the road. In transport, humans and machines entwine. In his work on railways Schivelbusch refers to this as the 'machine ensemble'. Similarly, the act of driving forges a human-machine chimera: a variety of Donna Haraway's 'cyborg'.¹³ Haraway's cyborg is a metaphor deployed to challenge the pre-eminence of boundary-making politics including human/animal and human/machine. In so doing she reformulates the world as a universe of fusion. The interactions between humans, animals and machines in the context of the safari park, but also far beyond it, suggest that the notion of the cyborg can be extended to contexts when the human-machine entwines with the lives of nonhuman animals. This fusion is exactly what manifests in the safari park where animal, human and automotive technology entwined. Human sensescapes and sensibilities were altered and animal behaviours reconfigured.

Importantly, too, the convergence of humans, wildlife and travel technology in and around the park reveals much about both local and national notions of landscape authenticity and the sense of identity that was bound to it. Indeed, 'animalscapes' were transformed into what I want to term 'beastscares', where undesirable and menacing creatures – human, animal and technological – lurked, threatening to diminish the perceived authenticity of the Wiltshire landscape. In sum, the story of the emergence of the English safari park in Wiltshire is really a narrative of trouble. In the safari park – and the wider rural landscape which it was a part of – authenticity itself was at stake. What follows suggests that when humans, animals and travel technologies interact with each other identities, relations and spaces are always reconfigured.

THE LIONS OF LONGLEAT

Country houses had been in decline since the end of the nineteenth century, and by the early years of the twentieth century they had reached their nadir. This was a period of decreasing profitability for country estates and this, combined with increased taxation, rendered many financially unviable.¹⁴ *The Field* magazine criticised them as 'incubuses sitting heavily upon impoverished acres which can no longer support them'.¹⁵ So vexing was this decline that the Gowers Committee, established in 1948, was tasked with considering how best to preserve this aspect of Britain's national heritage. Reporting in 1950, what came to be known as the Gowers Report warned that the terminal decline of these sites would be a catastrophic loss to the nation at large and it made a number of recommendations to reverse their fortunes. In addition to these proposals, some aristocratic fortunes were rebuilt through the transformation of the formerly exclusive aristocratic home into an increasingly inclusive tourist destination, especially over the course of the 1950s and 60s, when increased disposable income provided the middle classes with more opportunities to escape the city in search of leisure activities in the countryside.¹⁶

Though many country houses were abandoned or destroyed during or shortly after the Second World War, others were reimagined as public spaces and by the early 1960s around three hundred houses had been opened to visitors.¹⁷ Public access to country houses has a long precedent dating back to the early eighteenth century. The major innovation of the mid twentieth century, however, was the remodelling of these kinds of estates into businesses that consciously transformed casual visitors into fee-paying patrons. In many ways, stately homes that chose to remodel themselves in

this way ceased to exist for their own sakes, instead shape-shifting so that their *raison d'être* was increasingly the amusement of curious visitors.

Lord Bath first opened the gates to his Longleat House estate on a commercial basis in 1949, having had recent experience in the tourist industry through his management of the nearby Cheddar Caves. 130,000 people flocked to see the House during the ensuing twelve months but even this volume of visitors was not enough to keep the estate running profitably.¹⁸ In 1964 circus proprietor Jimmy Chipperfield approached Lord Bath with an idea to transform the Longleat estate into an animal park with a difference. Chipperfield had been born into the world-famous Chipperfield circus family in 1912 and had spent much of his life on the road with the family's travelling show. He had also established zoos in Plymouth and Southampton, and had developed his own animal capture enterprise in Uganda.¹⁹ Drawing on Chipperfield's experience of the animal business, 'The Lions of Longleat' was eventually constructed on one hundred acres of land originally known as Hazel Coppice, Icehouse Piece and the Grove, and it was cut off from the land around it by outer and inner fences fourteen and five feet high respectively.²⁰ In the spring of 1966, shortly before the park's opening, between forty and fifty lions arrived to occupy the enclosure, a substantial proportion having been directly acquired from their habitats in East Africa.²¹

WILDNESS AND LIBERTY IN CAPTIVITY

At the heart of Longleat's animal attraction was the construction of an illusory wild world. Both wildness and wilderness occupy prominent positions in western cultures. They denote a sense of the nonhuman acting autonomously in an environment entirely separated from all human influence. And yet this is a construction, a fantasy, which rests on an enduring binary of nature/culture. In this conceptualisation the wild and the domestic are polar opposites. In reality, however, living things exist along a continuum which connects the wild with the tame, nature with culture. Animals in places like national parks, zoos and safari parks (and those places themselves) are hybrids, creations of the interplays between the products and practices of humanity and the rest of the natural world.²² The choice of the lion as the focus of the safari experience is important in the crafting of a wild aesthetic. It is an archetypal African mammal, having been central to exotic animal collections for hundreds of years and which is the core of animal attractions today. The species reflects popular notions of wild and savage animality blood-red in tooth and claw. Depicted as the very zenith of natural potency by the 'great' white hunters of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries they were in many ways emblematic not only of a homogenised perception of wild Africa and all the nonhuman and human animals in it, but also of British power.²³ Their physical presence in the park put something of the untainted 'dark continent' at the height of British imperium on display. Though nestled deep in Wiltshire's rolling countryside where native species including buzzard, muntjac, osprey, roe deer and tawny owl live, the lions of Longleat were supposed to powerfully evoke seductive visions of wild Africa, its savage things and remote places.²⁴

Indeed, the park was meant to be even 'better than Africa' because it was – relatively speaking – right on the doorstep of most British people.²⁵ While photography and, increasingly, film brought images of Africa home to the public at large, Longleat prided itself on its ability to transport visitors to Africa without them ever needing to leave the UK. Chipperfield recalled in 1969 that 'apart from the background of very English Oak trees, one [could] almost visualise oneself on an African plain'. An early guidebook remarked that the park was a near-perfect duplication of the African mammals'

'natural habitat'.²⁶ More than that, however, it was claimed that visitors would be able to see even more than they would on a trip to Africa.²⁷ In the process Bath and Chipperfield sought to democratise the exotic experience of the safari vacation, which was itself benefitting from the international tourist boom of the 1950s and 60s.²⁸ As part of this, the park was populated not only by wildlife but also by humans. By the time of its opening in 1966 the Empire existed only, as Schwarz notes, in the memory and this cultural recollection was part of the park's wild aesthetic.²⁹ Staff members played their exotic parts in the park's presentation of the real by dressing in colonial clothing, riding on horseback and speaking in the accent 'usually reserved for the colonies' (though it is unclear what, exactly, that meant). Furthermore, indigenous peoples were excluded from the show. This was a white wild Africa writ small and, perhaps also, distinctively British.³⁰

Yet all the while there was an underlying recognition that the park was a fabrication of real Africa. It was an artifice crafted by Bath and Chipperfield but which demanded that visitors buy into the illusion in order to enjoy their day out. One reporter writing for the *Daily Telegraph* recognised days before the park's opening that 'no, I was not about to drive across Kenya's national park, but in "darkest" Wiltshire, at Longleat'.³¹ Similarly, a 1968 report noted that the one hundred acre reserve is 'only a stone's throw from lordly Longleat, but it could be a thousand miles ... here among the so-English lawns and squirrels is a piece of Africa'.³² This was not about people being fooled into thinking this was Africa relocated. Instead, it was the convergence of the wild and the domestic, of nature and culture, of exoticism and familiarity which sat at the heart of the park's appeal as a novel new breed of animal attraction.

At the core of this artifice of wildness was another illusion. The fantasy of freedom had become increasingly potent in zoos since the end of the nineteenth century. When it opened in 1966, Longleat was only the latest in a succession of captive spaces that experimented with a variety of ways in which human and nonhuman animals could encounter one another in less overtly artificial captive spaces. Increasingly, animal freedom and 'happiness' were at the core of such encounters. Since their inception, zoos and animal parks have transformed both their missions and their built geographies in response to the interplay between changing technologies and shifting public sensibilities. Animal and ethnographic showman and entrepreneur Carl Hagenbeck's panoramas (patented in 1896), at his Tierpark in Stellingen near Hamburg, Germany, for instance, did away with the traditional rigid iron bars of Victorian zoos. These kinds of structures made the incarceration of the animals explicit and, increasingly, captivity was equated in the public imagination with animal suffering. Instead, Hagenbeck transformed the technologies of captivity so that his animals were displayed in open air enclosures surrounded by moats. In this way, captive animals were presented as ostensibly at liberty, even happy, because the structures of their confinement were obscured. For many, liberty and contentment made the sight of captive creatures much more palatable.³³

An array of zoos throughout the United Kingdom, Europe and the US gradually followed suit, some employing open air as the only barrier separating humans from the exotic creatures on display. In the United Kingdom, the Zoological Society of London's Whipsnade Zoo in Bedfordshire is a notable example of the adoption of this kind of innovation. Indeed, it was the world's first fully 'barless' zoo when it opened to the public in 1931.³⁴ This illusion of freedom – and the allied sense of happiness and untainted animality that it implied – was increasingly essential to twentieth-century attitudes toward the lives of captive creatures. Growing sentimental attitudes towards animals as a result of a rising culture of pet-keeping and a fading perception of human vulnerability in the face of a violent

nature produced increasingly sympathetic attitudes towards wildlife and, in turn, their experiences of suffering.³⁵ These changes eventually resulted in the immersive enclosures of today's zoos which conceal captivity like never before.³⁶ The cultural context of the 1950s and 1960s played an important part in increasing sentimental attitudes toward wildlife even further. The formation of the World Wildlife Fund in 1961, the release of the 1966 film version of the book *Born Free*, and television series such as CBS's *Daktari* (based in Africa and featuring a host of African mammals and a human family committed to animal welfare), all reflect a taste for considering animals in wild rather than captive contexts while also playfully remarking on the relationship between wildness and domesticity. Significantly, the arrival of the television in the homes of the majority in the UK, much of Europe, and the US during the decades immediately after the Second World War – often beaming images of animals romping happily in vast and 'unspoilt' wildernesses – continued the process of entrenching a taste for animal freedom and happiness in the public imagination.³⁷

At Longleat, animal liberty and the authenticity of wildlife it implied was a central tenet of the park's identity. However, vital to the construction of this illusion of animal liberty was the automobile, which facilitated access to and immersion in animal domains well before the emergence of such exhibits in zoological gardens.³⁸ Travel technologies had already become integral to the promulgation of the artifice of freedom elsewhere. In 1953 businessman John P. Pederson and his wife Lilian opened a themed animal park in Boca Raton, Florida. Long before the arrival of Disney's or Universal's megabucks mega-parks, Africa: USA was over three hundred acres in size and featured 55,000 tropical plants. The park was designed to replicate the African landscape. Two thousand tourists travelled through the park every day, though they did not do so on foot. Instead, they were carried around the 'savannah' by tram.³⁹

Far more than the tram, however, the automobile was a powerful agent of social and cultural change and it offered a specific type of encounter with wildlife.⁴⁰ Lagging behind the US, the automobile became a popular form of locomotion in the UK after the Second World War, and particularly during the 'Long Boom', which began in the 1950s and during which levels of commercial output rocketed on a scale unprecedented in world history. The automobile market expanded internationally and increased competition forced market prices down.⁴¹ Not only was it – and the industry it represented – seen as the 'powerhouse' of the booming economy, it has also been viewed as fundamental to the remodelling of human relationships with space and time.⁴² A host of modern travel technologies present their own unique configurations of this relationship; Schivelbusch, for instance, has examined the ways in which the train journey recalibrated spatio-temporal perception by allowing vast spaces to be travelled over short spans of time. The same can be said of the automobile as journey times shortened and speed through space increased in accordance with the development of the technology and its associated infrastructure. This had a profound effect on people's understandings of, and interactions with, the environment.⁴³ Importantly, too, automobile technologies permitted people the freedom of the road (and sometimes the off-road) while simultaneously coercing them into a system of living in which the car and the routes it carves through the landscape become dominant features in the regulation of their day-to-day lives.⁴⁴ It is for these reasons that some scholars have referred to the automobile as a 'social-technical hybrid', emblematic of modernity and fundamentally altering our relationship with the world around us.⁴⁵ The automobile is, as John Urry argued, 'the literal "iron cage" of modernity, motorised, moving and domestic'.⁴⁶

The capacity of the automobile to shape perceptions and relationships is important in the context of human-animal encounters. At Longleat, Chipperfield was motivated by the kind of visual spectacle the car could permit, allowing visitors to see the animals from all angles as they drove among them ('a far better way to show animals than any other yet devised'), thereby enhancing the character of visitors' wildlife encounters.⁴⁷ Figure 3 depicts the course of the road through the lion enclosure. Its winding path was not only more 'natural', but was also a means of enhancing visibility by exposing animals on nearly all sides, letting visitors get close to animals wherever they may be in the reserve so that they might photograph them successfully.

The efficacy of this layout was dependent on the slow speed of the car. Measured movement through the enclosure focused attention on the fore and middle ground permitting the possibility of eye-to-eye encounters. This could be achieved safely and uniquely since the vehicle formed one's own mobile enclosure.⁴⁸ The car – a private domain – shields its passengers from dangerous exterior spaces, permitting safe access to the world beyond. The fact that most people entered the park in their own vehicles rather than in coaches or corporate vehicles (though these were available too) raised the possibility of a private proximal encounter with the animals. In the midst of charismatic creatures which were seen to sit in the borderlands of the wild and the tame visitors' own motorised iron cages were able to both protect and liberate in the creation of personalised and immersive wildlife experiences.⁴⁹ Indeed, when 'safari' first emerged as a tourist practice ('safari' means 'to take a journey' in Swahili and is applicable to a variety of contexts across Africa over time) in the early decades of the twentieth century, it too was about immersion among wild animals in the safe confines of motorised vehicles.⁵⁰

This notion — of animals apparently 'free' and humans confined and in very close proximity to each other — was essential to the allure of the wildlife experience the park was able to offer.⁵¹ Its appeal, of course, may well have been rooted in the fact that the 'captivity' afforded by the motorcar was itself an illusion. The 'cage' is semi-permeable and those inside may leave – if they so desire – at any point. Those in the safari park simply opted to shut themselves inside in order to facilitate the thrill of proximity to the supposedly wild beasts beyond.

In the safari park, then, the artifice of an authentic encounter with wildlife was absolutely dependent upon a particular kind of interaction among humans, their technologies and captive beasts. 'Wild' Africa was performed in an English landscape and that performance rested on the ability of the automobile to permit proximal encounters with wild beasts in safety. At the heart of this construction of authenticity, however, was a fundamental change in human and animal behaviours. In actuality the automobile shaped the natures of the beasts.

THE NATURES OF THE BEASTS

While the park consciously promulgated a sense of 'authentic' animality as part of the identity it sought to forge for itself, the interactions among humans, animals and the automobile altered the natures of captive animals and shaped human-animal encounters in the park. Indeed, for some the 'unnatural' conditions in which the park's inhabitants were maintained was a matter of much concern. As in more traditional zoos, some people worried that the environment at Longleat might be detrimental to the animals' wellbeing.⁵² Notwithstanding remarks likening the park to a 'prison camp', some criticism was levelled at the apposition inherent in the animals' display; the soggy, chilly climate of the English countryside was no place for exotic creatures from exotic places.⁵³ A

cartoon published in the *Daily Mirror* criticised the park's founding principles with reference to this juxtaposition. It depicts four miserable lions, wrapped in blankets and suffering from coughs and colds, taking refuge from the bleak southern English weather with a notably irritated Lord Bath in the cosy warmth of Longleat House.⁵⁴

Importantly, too, Chipperfield introduced measures to limit the numbers of lions produced through breeding and in order to militate against the possibility of escape. One correspondent wrote to Wiltshire County Council, arguing that breeding controls might deleteriously affect the psychologies of the animals. The letter proclaimed that 'a lion either deprived of mating privileges or a lioness of her cub seem to me dangerous propositions'.⁵⁵ Animals deprived of each other and of the possibility of mating, it was thought, would be predisposed to displays of frustration and aggression. A further concern related to the 'unnatural' number of lions that were to be displayed in the park's presentation of the African savannah. Forty to fifty animals were acquired to occupy the lion enclosure. In their African habitats, lions tend to live in groups comprised of three males and up to twelve females with their young. Their territories can reach nearly one hundred square kilometres in size.⁵⁶ Dr Desmond Morris, then curator at London Zoo, warned that the density of animals at Longleat might provoke heightened tensions which, in turn, may incite hyper-aggressive behaviour. So many animals, possibly comprising of two or three distinct groups ranging across an area nearly 250 times smaller than their natural range – despite the supposedly 'vast' scale of their captive domain – clearly represent a markedly condensed species population. Chipperfield later admitted that the integration of lion groups had resulted in fatalities following nocturnal skirmishes. After a short while, however, the lion groups coalesced into a single pride.⁵⁷

Of course, all of these criticisms are fair. Irus Braverman has delineated the various ways in which captivity shapes the natures of captive animals.⁵⁸ More than this, however, the conjunction of captive and automotive technologies also impacted on the nature of the beasts as well as human-animal relationships in the park. Human encounters with wildlife were heavily mediated through the very technology that sat at the heart of the park's aesthetic: the vistas and mobilities afforded by the motorcar. The presence of moving cars in such a restricted animalscape altered animal behaviours. Although there is no evidence relating directly to Longleat, a 1982 *New Scientist* article criticised the UK's safari parks as a whole. It recognised that through exposure to automotive technologies, wildness and domesticity had blurred: cars transformed into play things, or metallic prey species to be hunted.⁵⁹ The creation of these animal behaviours undermined Chipperfield's claims to be exhibiting wild animals in a habitat that was essentially Africa among the hills of Wiltshire.

From the visitors' perspective, at the same time as offering eye-to-eye encounters, the automobile could also close down a range of complementary sensory perceptions crafting in the process a particular kind of encounter. The variety of car, its speed and suspension calibrate the spatial experiences of those inside. Christopher Wells notes that 'enclosed cars insulated drivers from weather extremes and isolated them from the elements'.⁶⁰ Indeed, cars with all of their windows up, for example, shut off much sensory perception and in so doing shrink landscape experience to one that is predominantly visual in nature.⁶¹ This kind of sensory experience marks the variety of human-animal encounter at Longleat out as distinct from those typically offered in the traditional zoological garden, where sounds, smells, and sometimes touch, have formed part of visitors' encounters with wildlife for nearly two centuries. In the context of wildlife encounter at Longleat, where car windows were to be tightly shut, the automobile permitted the sight of wild beasts but it prevented the full

appreciation of their odours, and a perception of the sounds they emitted.⁶² And yet even in the context of the pre-eminence of vision, when we peer out of the windscreen, what are we really looking at? It is not the world beyond but rather a framed and distorted version of it. Alexander Wilson argues that the camera fragments the object of the gaze, exaggerating our estrangement from it.⁶³ Echoing this cinematic gaze, the car window objectifies and formulates.⁶⁴ In the words of Jonathan Crary, 'the viewing experience becomes somewhat sterilised', forging distance even in the midst of immersion.⁶⁵ This out of touch sensation is what Margaret Morse has called 'distraction'; real encounters are prevented by the architecture of the car.⁶⁶ The automobile may well have brought visitors close to the lions at Longleat, but it also fundamentally sterilised, framed, and mediated.

Precisely because of the conjunctions of proximity and freedom afforded through the watching of wildlife from the sanctum of the automobile, space was granted for the mobilisation of animal fantasies rooted in a sentimentalised conceptualisation of wildlife. The period between the 1930s and 1960s saw an increase in anthropomorphic constructions of animal life both in captive spaces and via the increasingly popular media of television and film.⁶⁷ Motion pictures such as those produced by Walt Disney, encouraged viewers to relate to animals as if they were human friends with minds that were eminently knowable within human perceptual frameworks. Consequently, many of these almost-human animals were stripped of the capacity to intentionally inflict harm and this perpetuated a desire for human contact with 'cute' and 'cuddly' creatures.⁶⁸ At the same time, people were being transformed into armchair naturalists through the arrival of natural history documentaries from the BBC's Natural History Unit in Bristol. These documentaries, particularly in the 1950s and early 1960s, offered up a new kind of nature. Early broadcasts showed animals either in zoos or studios or in their wild places, via footage bought in from expeditions. Alongside films such as *Born Free*, the British public were confronted with animals who could be interacted with but which were also of wild worlds.⁶⁹ Two specific early incidents at Longleat indicate that some visitors to the park were vulnerable to seduction by these confusing visions of nature. Importantly the slow speed of the car through the animal space broke down the detachment to environment imposed by high velocity motor vehicles, allowing visitors the opportunity to act on their animal fantasies.⁷⁰ In 1968 Lord Bath reported that over the course of the two years since the park's opening, two people had left their vehicles in order to approach the lions so that they could take photographs with them.⁷¹ Chipperfield later recalled an episode in which a woman left her car before strolling towards the lions' huts to see if anybody was at home.⁷² Both of these encounters were directly facilitated by the proximity and freedom afforded by the automobile and a culturally contextual sense of what authentic animality actually looked like. Moreover, they disclose a tension at the heart of the human-animal-machine amalgam that underpinned the park's animal spectacle. Visitors' private iron cages did not represent the erection of boundaries that were insurmountable. Doors could be unlocked and windows opened and visitors could very easily, if they so wished, move from their mobile 'safe' space into the animalscape surrounding them. While animal encounters from the safety of an automobile might loosely represent an inversion of captivity, it was a reversal that rested upon the understanding of the danger large carnivores could pose to life and limb. Thus, the illusion of authenticity was disrupted by the very conditions – captivity and automobility – that were meant to facilitate real encounters with wildlife. And yet, it was not only the authenticity of the captive animals and human encounters with them that were troubled. The enduring nature of the

broader landscape – of Longleat, of Wiltshire, and of England itself – was also seen to be at risk by the presence of a multitude of beasts in the Wiltshire wilds.

A RURAL 'BEASTSCAPE'

In spite of the ways in which animal behaviours and human-animal interactions were moulded by the affordances among humans, animals and travel technologies, authentic wildness remained an integral aspect of the park's public image. The imagination of wildness, however, meant that this authenticity became an issue at stake well beyond the park's boundaries. Longleat's lions were reformulated, in the minds of many, into invasive animals, terrifying and uncontrolled, roaming where they categorically did not belong. The prospect of the arrival of this species in the rural spaces of Wiltshire invoked a public unease resulting in vehement opposition to the idea of the park during its development. An editorial piece in *The Times* was of the opinion that 'this is one of the most fantastically unsuitable uses for a stretch of England's green and pleasant land that can ever have entered the head of a noble proprietor', illustrating a sense of Wiltshire's authentic, timeless beauty denigrated by animals out of place.⁷³ Lions were not, however, the only 'beasts' to threaten to transform the Wiltshire landscape. This was a landscape construed as exclusive, peaceful, and even exceedingly English. Other monsters, this time human and mechanical, were also – in the view of many – unwelcome contaminants of a pure rural world. Public reactions to these kinds of creatures reveal what was considered to be in and out of place. In short, notions of authenticity and the identities bound up with it were troubled through the park's creation of an imaginary landscape extending far beyond its own boundaries. In this 'beastscape' – to commandeer and twist the concept of 'animalscape' introduced by geographers Matless, Watkins, and Merchant in order to denote not only the presence of animals in a landscape but also the monstrous and the 'out of place' – all kinds of human and more-than-human others infringed on, threatened and came to redefine Wiltshire's landscapes.⁷⁴

Much opposition to the creation of the Lions of Longleat centred on public anxieties surrounding the ways in which the presence of non-native animals might threaten public safety and detrimentally affect some of the native animalscapes of the Wiltshire region. Such apprehensions reflected a powerful perception of the threat posed by out of place and, by implication, uncontrolled animals. *The Times* published an editorial piece in September 1965 that attacked proposals for the park's development. The broadsheet argued that Lord Bath had overstepped the mark in his efforts to make his estate profitable again: 'Up 'til now the man-eating propensities of lions have happily been left in the realm of light verse', the article proclaimed in reference to Stanley Holloway's famous c. 1930 poem 'Albert and the Lion'. With 'fifty of the great beasts' in the Wiltshire countryside, it was only a matter of time until a 'fatal accident' would take place, it forewarned. An escaped lion would pay no heed to county borders, argued Lady Muriel Dalzell. It would be at 'liberty, seeking what it might devour ... the lion would in effect be free to roam at large over any county it wished and when the pangs of hunger assailed it, any lamb, dog or even larger animal it might encounter would have a very swift dispatch'.⁷⁵ Likewise, Councillor Albert Bull of Frome Rural Council remarked, apparently in reference to a famous ESSO campaign and following complaints from residents of nearby Leigh-on-Mendip, seven miles from Longleat, that 'it is one thing to have a tiger in your tank but it is an entirely different matter [sic] to have a lion in your lap'. There were allied concerns, too, that the presence of lions in the vicinity might distress companion animals and local livestock and in some instances it was the sounds of the lions as well as their bodies that were viewed as invasive.⁷⁶

Though Lord Bath and Jimmy Chipperfield claimed that the lions on the estate would be prevented from breeding so as to limit the numbers of animals being produced, fears of beastly incursions upon the Wiltshire landscape were far from assuaged. Indeed, the *Western Daily Press* reported that 'visions of hungry demented lions roaming the lanes of Wiltshire and Somerset have already brought a whiff of jungle terror to some people who live in the area'.⁷⁷ Chipperfield and Bath consequently implemented strategies to reduce any possibility of the lions escaping or causing damage to visitors or their property. Trees and heavy branches close to the paddock's perimeter fence were felled, while an entrance enclosure that added an additional gate to create a double-layered entry system was built so that cars could safely enter the lions' domain without the creatures getting out.⁷⁸ All of this served to prevent non-native species infiltrating the Wiltshire countryside.

Invasive animals apart, public anxiety was not wholly centred on a localised fear of unrestrained animals out of place. More significantly, other kinds of beasts – human and technological – were also seen to be defiling this small corner of England's green and pleasant land, reshaping its identity in the process. Despite significant degrees of opposition, the idea (and, later, the reality) of the park attracted a substantial level of excitement. From Good Friday 1966, the numbers of visitors arriving at Longleat dramatically increased, and with them came their automobiles. Chipperfield recalled that on that day roads between the nearby towns of Warminster and Frome were completely jammed, while motorists queued for some five or six hours to gain entrance. Chipperfield alleged that local residents contacted the police to complain that they were unable to leave their houses since local roadways had become unmanageably congested.⁷⁹ While most scholarship relating to anti-automobile sentiment has focussed on the motorway, discourse surrounding Longleat shows that 'moments of disquiet' applied to smaller roads, too.⁸⁰

In the twelve months following the park's opening in 1966, 188,500 visitors' cars entered the estate along with 580 motor coaches, while almost a thousand cars entered the park every day during August 1966. Demand was so high that a five-hour queue to enter the park formed on Easter Monday in 1967.⁸¹ Over the course of the following two years from 1966 to 1968, visitor numbers grew rapidly from 486,500 to 727,000.⁸² The parish Council of the nearby village of Corsley was so concerned about the level of traffic coursing through the village to and from Longleat that it refused to consent to road improvements because they feared that while such enhancements might well improve traffic flow, it might simultaneously encourage the use of the roads by increasing numbers of motorists.⁸³ It was also noted that motorcar traffic to and from Longleat clogged up practically the whole narrow and winding road through the nearby village of Horningsham.⁸⁴

The 1967-68 development of 'Reserve B' was a direct result of the astonishing level of visitor numbers in the initial years of the park's existence in addition to emerging concerns about the changing character of the rural environment. This new captive space was designed to display deer, zebra, and giraffe; it was essentially a controlled picnic area. Significantly, however, it would also allow visitors' cars to be siphoned off along an extra two miles of road. In so doing, it would alleviate congestion of the surrounding area at peak times, while simultaneously allowing more cars into the park. Commercial imperative aside, this reflects a sense within Longleat's management that vast numbers of cars were detrimental to the preservation of the estate as well as the wider rural landscape.⁸⁵

Metallic beasts did not arrive of their own volition, of course, for riding inside them were human animals. In many ways, the creatures considered 'out of place' and impacting on a supposedly authentic way of life were not necessarily the wild beasts on the lawn, nor the metallic monsters coursing through animal and human spaces, but the humans who were brought to Wiltshire in their beastly machines. Hordes of middle class leisure-seekers headed into rural Wiltshire, and they provoked irritation among local residents as the local landscape dramatically transformed around them. Following the 1965 announcement that Longleat would open the following spring, one correspondent wrote to the *Telegraph* complaining that stately homes will increasingly attract 'the rabble who prefer fun-fairs and zoos'.⁸⁶ By 1968 the *Wiltshire Gazette and Herald* reported that 'as we left Longleat, a woman in a nearby house told me "at night, when the wind blows this way, we can hear them roaring. It is quite eerie. But the lions we accept now. It's the people who come to see them that's the bother"'.⁸⁷

Interactions between humans, animals and travel technologies at Longleat formed a powerful three-fold beast that gravely threatened an enduring sense of the authenticity of the Wiltshire countryside in which the Longleat estate had stood for centuries and the way of life of those who dwelled there. While these changes were evidently of concern to local people, many of these anxieties were echoed even more vociferously far beyond the park's immediate locality. An October 1965 Wiltshire County Council report remarked that there was relatively 'little adverse comment from people living nearby: people living miles away seem terrified by a prospect that cannot really concern them'.⁸⁸ Indeed, this aligns with a far more widespread sense of national dislocation, disintegration, and decline that was rooted in a gathering sense of mourning for a romanticised England. Writing in 1943 British author John Betjeman pondered the fate of England's provincial towns. The twists and turns of quiet country roads were being replaced, he noticed, by straightened monstrosities along which motorists roared without taking a second to gaze upon the beauty of the landscape surrounding them. Significantly, he conceived of these changes using the language of conflict: The 'old towns of England are numerous enough to survive a decade of barbarian bombing', he proclaimed, 'but their texture is so delicate that a single year of over-enthusiastic "post-war reconstruction" may destroy the lot'.⁸⁹ Importantly, this really was mourning for England rather than for Britain. Reflecting the extent to which national identity was intimately bound to notions of a particular kind of English landscape, Betjeman's attitude reflects a mounting concern for the state of England's countryside in the early part of the twentieth century. In some ways fears of old England fading to nothing reflect some of the worries of US wilderness conservationists such as Aldo Leopold, who saw the automobile as wholly 'incompatible with the undeveloped, isolated characteristics of the places that they hoped to preserve'.⁹⁰ Romanticised this vision of England might have been, but it was compelling nonetheless and it was at the heart of the ideas underpinning the Roads Beautifying Association (1928). Debates surrounding the ways in which roads could be aesthetically modelled to preserve the English landscape were still ongoing in the 1950s, showing that there was a strong connection between the arrival of the road and the intensifying appeal to English nationalism.⁹¹

A rising unease at the apparent loss of the essence of the English countryside, the traditionally exclusive preserve of the elite, reflects this broader sense of national disintegration or dilution. Labour Party politician for Brixton Marcus Lipton's concerted attempts to block the development of the animal park at Longleat, for instance, did not relate to his own constituency in South London. Complaining in parliament during early summer of 1966, Lipton argued that it was 'quite ridiculous

that whereas planning permission, licenses, or permits are sometimes required for quite the most trivial changes of use or alterations, it is possible for anyone to come along and fill acres of English countryside with wild animals'.⁹²

Similarly, national newspapers joined the conversation, mounting various arguments against the creation of the park in the second half of 1965. *The Times*, for instance, remarked that 'the old landlords...seldom lost their feel for their native soil ... cattle, sheep, and deer ought to be good enough for a Wiltshire man', referring of course to the occupation of the habitats of the Longleat estate by non-native exotic fauna.⁹³ Figure 4, a satirical illustration published in the *Bath and Wiltshire Chronicle* in the months preceding the park's opening, exemplifies an underlying uneasiness at the 'out of place' exotic creatures disrupting something of the essential authenticity of the English countryside. The caption – 'never been out of the country old boy - bagged that on the A362 outside Frome' – denotes a sense of inversion, of the exotic displacing the native and of the alien Other out of place in a formerly exclusive — elite — habitat. Another writer argued that 'Longleat is such a beautiful place and to turn it into a prison camp for lions with high fences, armed guards and fierce dogs seems abominable'.⁹⁴ This comment is particularly evocative, for it alludes to the combination of a fear of the physical threat posed by Longleat's beasts-out-of-place and an evident antagonism towards changing land-use and the desecration of the estate's natural beauty.

CONCLUSION

The initial novelty of this variety of animal attraction led not only to its expansion to include grazing animals and monkeys in 1968 but also to its duplication all over the world. Similar parks opened in the UK near Windsor (1969), Woburn (1970), Knowsley (1971), Blair Drummond (1971) and a bear park along the same lines was established at Loch Lomond (1970).⁹⁵ Lion Country Safari parks were opened in the US in Laguna Hills, California in 1970 (where, like Longleat, all highways to the attraction were jammed) and also in Ohio, Virginia, and California.⁹⁶ Parks also opened in the Netherlands, France, Canada, Germany and Japan, all of them presenting a variety of animal encounter which rested upon the artifice of animal 'freedom' in represented African wilds. At Longleat, staging wildlife in this way reveals aspects of the ways in which human-animal and human-environmental relationships were affected by technology – automotive and captive – in the post-war years. Its development and early days inspired questions of authenticity in relation to what constitutes real, untarnished animal natures, authentic English landscapes and ways of life, and its operation illustrates the ways in which the human-machine cyborg might be complicated by the presence of non-human animals. Importantly, too, the convergence of two imaginative tropes – that of exotic Africa and a 'green and pleasant', aristocratic and rather exclusive England – disrupted and troubled the precise authenticity at the core of each construction. At its heart the process of constructing 'authenticity' actually entrenched artificiality and hybridity.

The 1982 *New Scientist* article referred to above proposed that these types of human-animal spaces might not endure for they were founded both on a sense of novelty and on dubious animal practices.⁹⁷ Indeed, the safari-style bear park at Loch Lomond had been forced to close in 1974 in light of dwindling visitor numbers and many of the parks that had arisen in response to Longleat's success either closed or reconfigured their ethos and displays in the ensuing years.⁹⁸ Though some safari parks did not stand the test of time, the grip of the drive-through wildlife park on the public imagination remains strong. One such experience sits among the bubbling springs of Yellowstone

National Park in the US. Yellowstone Bear World, like Longleat and the other safari parks that emerged from the middle of the 1960s, 'presents free-roaming wildlife ... as you drive'.⁹⁹ Indeed supposedly authentic wildlife experiences mediated by technologies that permit mobility through animalscapes have grown in popularity over the course of the twentieth century in the so-called wild places themselves. Vacations in eastern and southern Africa, for instance, may feature jeep safaris, flights through African skies in the hope of spying one of 'nature's great events' like the wildebeest migrations across the Serengeti, boat rides among humpback whales, or scuba excursions with eye-to-eye interactions with aquatic species. Humans, animals, technologies and environments are inseparable, not only in the safari park and in the context of wildlife encounter more broadly, but all over the world. Bound together, they influence one another's complexions as well as our perceptions of the environment. This essay has explored the ways in which literatures concerned with animals and spatial mobilities might combine in order to aid our understanding of the multispecies character of the landscapes of modernity. Geographers and historians might do well to reconsider what kinds of impacts wildlife experiences mediated by travel technologies have had and continue to have, not least on the ways of life, bodies and behaviours of tourists and indigenous peoples alike, but also on fragile and easily manipulated animal natures, landscapes and environments.

ENDNOTES

¹ Longleat Safari and Adventure Park, www.longleat.co.uk [accessed 26 February 2016].

² See, for instance, J. Lorimer, Nonhuman charisma, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 25.1 (2007) 911-32; C. Philo and C. Wilbert (Eds), *Animal Places, Beastly Spaces: New Geographies of Human-Animal Relations*, London, 2000; J. R. Wolch and J. Emel, Bringing the animal back in, *Society and Space D: Environment and Planning* 13 (1995) 632-36; J. R. Wolch and J. Emel (Eds), *Animal Geographies: Place, Politics and Identity in the Nature-Culture Borderlands*, London, 1998; S. Whatmore, *Hybrid Geographies: Nature, Culture, Spaces*, New York, 2002; J. Urbanik, *Placing Animals: An Introduction to the Geography of Human-Animal Relations*, Lanham, 2012.

³ On the history of zoos see, for instance, E. Baratay and E. Hardouin-Fugier, *Zoo: A History of Zoological Gardens in the West*, London, 2001; I. Braverman, *Zooland: The Institution of Captivity*, Stanford, 2013; E. Hanson, *Animal Attractions: Nature on Display in American Zoos*, Princeton, 2002; H. Ritvo, *The Animal Estate: The English and other Creatures in the Victorian Age*, Cambridge MA, 1987, Chapter 5; N. Rothfels, *Savages and Beasts: The Birth of the Modern Zoo*, Baltimore, 2002.

⁴ H. Buller, *Animal geographies I*, *Progress in Human Geography* (2013) 1-11; H. Buller, *Animal geographies II: methods*, *Progress in Human Geography* (2014) 1-11.

⁵ Project Splatter, <https://projectsplatter.co.uk/> [accessed, 3 June 2016].

⁶ See, for instance, T. Cresswell, *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World*, London, 2006, and S. Hinchcliffe *Inhabiting - Landscapes and Natures*, in: K. Anderson, M. Domosh, S. Pile, and N. Thrift (Eds), *Handbook of Cultural Geography*, London, 2003, 207-25. On Europe see, for instance, W. H. Rollins, *Whose landscape? Technology, fascism, and environmentalism on the National Socialist autobahn*, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 85 (1995) 494-520; T. Zeller, *Driving Germany: The Landscape of the Autobahn, 1930-1970*, New York, 2007. On the USA see M. Gandy, *Concrete and Clay: Reworking Nature in New York City*, London, 2002; A. Krim, *Route 66: Iconography of the American Highway*, Santa Fe, 2005.

⁷ P. Merriman, "A new look at the English landscape": landscape, architecture, movement and the aesthetics of motorways in early post-war Britain, *Cultural Geographies* 13 (2006) 78-105; P. Merriman, *Driving Spaces: A*

Cultural-Historical Geography of England's M1 Motorway, Oxford, 2007; P. Merriman, *Automobility and the geographies of the car*, *Geography Compass* 3.2 (2009) 586-99. A plethora of scholars have considered the relationships between vision and mobility. See J. Crary, *Techniques of the observer: on vision and modernity in the nineteenth century*, Cambridge, 1990; W. Schivelbusch, *The Railway Journey: The Industrialisation of Time and Space in the Nineteenth Century*, Berkeley, California, 1996; M. Schwarzer, *Zoomscape: Architecture in motion and media*, New York, 2004, 22; N. Thrift, *Driving the in city: Theory, Culture, and Society* 21.4-5 (2004) 41-59.

⁸ Merriman, *Driving Spaces*, chapters. 3-5.

⁹ Merriman, *A new look*, 95; Schwarzer, *Zoomscape*, 22.

¹⁰ Schwarzer, *Zoomscape*, 71.

¹¹ J. Urry, *The system of automobility*, *Theory, Culture, and Society* 21.4-5 (2004) 26.

¹² Urry, *System of automobility*, 26; Vehicle Licensing Statistics, <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/vehicle-licensing-statistics-2013> [accessed 1 June 2016]; Britons spend more time driving than socialising, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/motoring/news/8287098/Britons-spend-more-time-driving-than-socialising.html> [accessed, 1 June 2016].

¹³ D. Haraway, *A cyborg manifesto: science, technology, and socialist-feminism in the late twentieth century*, in: D. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, New York, 1991, 149-81; Schivelbusch, *Railway Journey*, 24.

¹⁴ P. Mandler, *The Fall and Rise of the Stately Home*, New Haven, 1997, Chapter 7.

¹⁵ *The Field*, 28 March 1931, 12.

¹⁶ *The Times*, 11 May 1974, 14.

¹⁷ Mandler, *Fall and Rise*, 371.

¹⁸ H. A. Clemenson, *English Country-Houses and Landed Estates*, London, 1982, 166-67; Mandler, *Fall and Rise*, 373.

¹⁹ J. Chipperfield, *My Wild Life*, New York, 1976, Chapters 1-9.

²⁰ Peter Kilby, *Chartered Architect*, Longleat Development Plan September 1967, Swindon and Wiltshire Archives, Longleat File (hereafter SWALF).

²¹ 24 lions chosen for Longleat, *The Times*, 4 October 1965.

²² See K. Anderson, *Culture and nature at the Adelaide Zoo: At the frontiers of "human" geography*, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 20.3 (1995), 275-94; K. Anderson, *A walk on the wild side: a critical geography of domestication*, *Progress in Human Geography* 21.4 (1997) 463-85; H. Ritvo, *Beasts of the Jungle (or wherever)*, *Daedalus* (Spring 2008) 22-30. To simplify matters, now that the notion of wild has been problematized, this essay will use it without the addition of 'scare quotes'.

²³ J. M. Mackenzie, *The Empire of Nature: Hunting, Conservation and British Imperialism*, Manchester, 1988, 47; Ritvo, *Animal Estate*, 26.

²⁴ Conservation at Longleat, n.d., <https://www.longleat.co.uk/upload/pdf/Conservation.pdf> [Accessed 25 January 2016].

²⁵ There is a vast literature pertaining to the simulation of exotic places in Europe and, indeed, it has a long history. For one of the best treatments of this emerging 'world-as-exhibition' phenomenon, in which the 'outside' world was simulated as 'authentically' as possible, see T. Mitchell, *Colonising Egypt*, Cambridge, 1988.

²⁶ Lord Bath and J. Chipperfield, *The Lions of Longleat*, London, 1969, 62; *The Lions of Longleat TM Safari Souvenir Magazine*, Wiltshire, c. 1970.

²⁷ Armed men to guard lions, *Wiltshire Times and News*, 15 August 1965.

²⁸ MacKenzie, *Empire of Nature*, 307.

²⁹ B. Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, Volume 1: *The White Man's World*, Oxford, 2011, 5.

³⁰ White hunter watch on Longleat safari, *Daily Telegraph*, 4 April 1966.

³¹ White hunter watch on Longleat safari, *Daily Telegraph*, 4 April 1966.

³² A noble Lord had to twist Wilt's tail to get lions to Longleat, *The Wiltshire Gazette and Herald*, 28 January 1968.

³³ Rothfels, *Savages and Beasts*, 161-74.

³⁴ J. Ironmonger, *The Good Zoo Guide*, London, 1992, 147-50; *The Times*, 15 September 1930, 7.

³⁵ See Baratay and Hardouin-Fugier, *Zoo*, Chapter 3, and M. Cartmill, *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature through History*, Cambridge, MA, 1993, Chapter 9.

³⁶ Braverman, *Zooland*.

³⁷ See D. Bousé, *Wildlife Films*, University Park, Philadelphia, 2000; G. Mitman, *Reel Nature: America's Romance with Wildlife on Film*, Cambridge, MA, 1999.

³⁸ Braverman, *Zooland*, 33-8.

³⁹ Africa: USA was, however, short-lived. In 1960 a plague of red ticks infested the park's animals and it closed its gates for good: *History of Africa: USA*, <http://www.africa-usa.com/history.html> [accessed 19 June 2014]; T. Brown, From the archives: the first safari park, *The Journal of the Independent Zoo Enthusiasts Society* (Autumn 2014) 29-31; E. Kleinberg, *Palm Beach Post*, 20 February 2002, <http://www.africa-usa.com/pbpost/pbpost.html> [accessed 19 June 2015].

⁴⁰ Urry, *System of Automobility*, 26.

⁴¹ M. Sedgewick and M. Gillies, *A-Z of Cars, 1945-1970*, Bideford, 1989.

⁴² The degree to which car ownership increased in Europe lagged behind that of the USA by a couple of decades. D. Edgerton, *The Shock of the Old: Technology and Global Change since 1900*, London, 2006, 52, 69. Also see Merriman, *Driving Spaces*.

⁴³ C. Mauch and T. Zeller, Introduction, in: C. Mauch and T. Zeller (Eds), *The World Beyond the Windshield: Roads and Landscapes in the United States and Europe*, Athens, 2008, 1-13, Schivelbusch, *Railway Journey*; C. Wells, *Car Country: An Environmental History*, Washington, 2015, xxxiii.

⁴⁴ M. Sheller, *Automotive emotions: feeling the car*, *Theory, Culture & Society* 21:4/5 (2004), 221; Urry, *System of Automobility*, 27-28.

⁴⁵ S. Lash and J. Urry, *Economies of Signs and Space*, London, 1994, 252-56; D. Miller, *Car Cultures*, Oxford, 2001.

⁴⁶ Urry, *System of Automobility*, 28. Also see Wells, *Car Country*, 2015.

⁴⁷ This kind of rationale was also present when cars started arriving in Africa's new national parks from the late 1920s: J. Carruthers, *The Kruger National Park: A Social and Political History*, Pietermaritzburg, 1995 74-75; Chipperfield, *Wild Life*, 145.

⁴⁸ Chipperfield, *Wild Life*, 157-8, 164. Some scholars have shown how important the 'view through the windshield' was to road planners and politicians as they sought to mobilise and satisfy the publics who would use the road. See D. Louter, *Glaciers and gasoline: the making of a windshield wilderness, 1900-1915*, in: D. M. Wrobel and P. T. Long (Eds), *Seeing and being seen: tourism in the American West*, Lawrence, 2001. Also see S. Julin, "A feeling almost beyond description": scenic roads in South Dakota's Custer State Park, 1919-32, in: C. Mauch and T. Zeller (Eds), *The World Beyond the Windshield: Roads and Landscapes in the United States and Europe*, Athens, 2008, 79-93. For more on this variety of so-called 'active travelling' and the design of roads in order to mould the traveller gaze, see Zeller, *Driving Germany*, 128.

⁴⁹ *The Lions of Longleat TM Safari Souvenir Magazine*, Wiltshire, c. 1970; *Woburn Wild Animal Kingdom*, Bedfordshire c. 1971.

⁵⁰ MacKenzie, *Empire of Nature*, 306-07.

⁵¹ Chipperfield, *My Wild Life*, 160.

⁵² Letter to the Chairman of the County Council, 19 November 1965, SWALF.

⁵³ Correspondence to the Chairman of Wiltshire County Council, 8 November 1965, SWALF.

⁵⁴ Got any more bright ideas? *Daily Mirror*, 5 April 1966.

⁵⁵ Letter to the Chairman of the Frome County Council, 19 November 1965, SWALF; H. S. McLaren, *Letters to the Editor: Lions at Longleat*, *The Western Gazette*, 3 December 1965.

⁵⁶ Correspondence from Dr Desmond Morris, Curator of Mammals, ZSL, to R. P. Harries, Clerk of Wiltshire County Council, 6 October 1965, SWALF; *African Lion*, <http://animals.nationalgeographic.com/animals/mammals/african-lion/> [Accessed, 26 July 2015].

⁵⁷ Bath and Chipperfield, *Lions of Longleat*, 37.

⁵⁸ Braverman, *Zooland*, 57-62.

⁵⁹ G. Vines, *Safari parks, after the honeymoon*, *New Scientist*, 2 December 1982, 554-57.

⁶⁰ Wells, *Car Country*, 217.

⁶¹ For more on this see W. Rollins, *Reflections on a spare tire: SUVs and postmodern environmental consciousness*, *Environmental History* 11 (October 2006) 688.

⁶² The arrival of the drive-through monkey exhibit in 1968 presented another variety of encounter - often of the destructive sort as the animals tore of windscreen wipers, for instance - entirely. This aspect of the park is, however, beyond the scope of this article's analysis.

-
- ⁶³ A. Wilson, *The Culture of Nature: North American Landscape from Disney to Exxon Valdez*, Cambridge, MA, 1992, 122.
- ⁶⁴ A. Friedburg, Urban mobility and cinematic Visuality: the screens of Los Angeles – endless cinema or private telematics? *Journal of Visual Culture* 1 (2002) 183-204; P. Virilio, *The last vehicle*, in: Dietmar Kamper and Christoph Wulf (Eds), *Looking Back on the End of the World*, trans. D. Antal, Semiotext(e), 106-10.
- ⁶⁵ Crary, *Techniques of the observer*, p. 125; Schwarzer, *Zoomscape*, 23.
- ⁶⁶ M. Morse, *Virtualities: Television, Media Art and Cyberculture*, Bloomington, 1998, Chapter Four.
- ⁶⁷ Cartmill, *Death in the Morning*, Chapter 9.
- ⁶⁸ Mitman, *Reel Nature*, 119.
- ⁶⁹ G. Davies, *Networks of nature: stories of natural history film-making from the BBC*, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University College London, 1998, Chapter 4.
- ⁷⁰ Schwarzer, *Zoomscape*, 109
- ⁷¹ A noble Lord had to twist Wilt's tail to get lions to Longleat, *The Wiltshire Gazette and Herald*, 28 January 1968.
- ⁷² Bath and Chipperfield, *Lions of Longleat*, 13, 56. Carruthers also reports this variety of visitor behaviour in the Kruger National Park, illustrating that it was far from isolated at Longleat: Carruthers, *75*.
- ⁷³ *The Lions of Longleat*, *The Times*, 2 September 1965.
- ⁷⁴ 'Animalscape' is a term used by Charles Watkins, David Matless, and Paul Merchant to refer to a place characterised or shaped by the presence of animals: D. Matless, P. Merchant and C. Watkins, *Animal landscapes: otters and wildfowl in England, 1945-1970*, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30 (2005) 191-205.
- ⁷⁵ Letter from Lady Muriel Dalzell, Wedmore, Somerset: *Longleat Lions*, *Telegraph*, 15 September 1965.
- ⁷⁶ Ban-these-lions move is delayed, *Evening Chronicle*, 9 October 1965; Of live lions and a dead dragon, *Western Daily Press*, 13 November 1965
- ⁷⁷ Of live lions and a dead dragon, *Western Daily Press*, 13 November 1965.
- ⁷⁸ *Lions at Longleat: Questionnaire regarding this project giving appropriate answers and additional information where available c. 1965 SWALF*.
- ⁷⁹ Chipperfield, *Wild Life*, 175-77. It was only in the post-war period that Californians, for instance, began to see the automobile and its highways as undermining their efforts to preserve the great Redwood forests in the north west: G. Bartlett, *Drive-by viewing: drive-by consciousness and forest preservation in the automobile age*, *Technology and Culture* 45.1 (2004) 30-54. For more on the changing status of the automobile in the USA see Sutter, *Driven Wild*.
- ⁸⁰ Merriman, *Automobility*, 588.
- ⁸¹ Peter Kilby, *Chartered Architect*, *Longleat Development Plan*, September 1967, and *Easter with the lions*, *Times and News*, 15 April 1966, both in SWALF.

⁸² Bath and Chipperfield, Lions of Longleat, 13.

⁸³ Correspondence from Dennis Walters to R. P. Harries, Clerk of Wiltshire County Council, 19 April 1966 and Correspondence from the Chief Constable, Wiltshire Constabulary, to the Clerk of Wiltshire County Council, 28 April 1966, both in SWALF.

⁸⁴ Correspondence from T. B. Elliot to Dr N. W. Graham Campbell, 29 March 1971, SWALF. Also see Correspondence from A. T. Anderson, Clerk to Horningsham Parish Council, to R. P. Harries, Clerk to Wilts County Council, 19 September 1968, SWALF.

⁸⁵ Bath and Chipperfield, Lions of Longleat.

⁸⁶ Letter from Angela Wrangham, Bromley, Kent: Stately homes, Telegraph, 15 September 1965.

⁸⁷ A noble Lord had to twist Wilt's tail to get lions to Longleat, The Wiltshire Gazette and Herald, 28 January 1968.

⁸⁸ Instructions for Counsel to Advise: Lions at Longleat, 20 October 1965, SWALF.

⁸⁹ B. Cowell, The Heritage Obsession: The Battle for England's Past, Stroud, 2008, 110.

⁹⁰ Wells, Car Country, 222.

⁹¹ Merriman, A new look.

⁹² Now the Longleat lions can roam in peace, Western Daily Press, 25 May 1966; Planning and the Longleat lions, The Times, 25 May 1966.

⁹³ The Lions of Longleat, The Times, 2 September 1965.

⁹⁴ Correspondence to the Chairman of Wiltshire County Council, 8 November 1965, SWALF.

⁹⁵ Author's telephone conversation with Tony Hopkins, Circus Master at Billy Smart's circus, 11 March 2013; News in Brief, The Times, 24 November 1969, 2; News in Brief, The Times, 22 January 1970, 4.

⁹⁶ Lion Country Pamphlet, c. 1970, and Press Release: Jerry Kobrin, Lion Country Safari Inc. 1972, Orange County Records Office; King's Island Souvenir Book, Ohio: c. 1975, 2; Lions will no longer roam King's Dominion, The Free Lance Star, 4 November 1993.

⁹⁷ Vines, Safari Parks, 554-57.

⁹⁸ News in Brief, The Times, 10 December 1974, 2.

⁹⁹ Yellowstone Bear World, www.yellowstonebearworld.com [Accessed, 20 February 2016].